

Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

Persistent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/139665>

How to cite:

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk.

Psychological type and psychological temperament among Readers within the
Church of England: A complementary ministry?

Leslie J. Francis*

University of Warwick, Coventry, England, UK

Susan H. Jones

Liverpool Cathedral, Liverpool, England, UK

Andrew Village

York St John University, York, England, UK

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Leslie J. Francis

Centre for Educational Development, Appraisal and Research (CEDAR)

The University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

Within the Church of England Readers are lay ministers trained and authorised to lead services and to preach. The Church of England's National Readers' Conference draws together Readers from across the dioceses and provides a window into the skills and aptitudes of those who are shaping that form of recognised lay ministry. This study draws on data provided by 59 male Readers and 96 female Readers attending the national conference in 2013 in order to profile the psychological type and psychological temperament of these lay ministers and to compare these profiles with data published in 2007 on 626 clergymen and 237 clergywomen serving in the Church of England. Readers are significantly more likely than clergy to prefer sensing and to prefer judging. The consequence is a much higher proportion of the SJ Epimethean temperament among Readers: 56% among male readers, compared with 31% among clergymen, and 60% among female readers, compared with 29% among clergywomen. The implications of these findings are discussed for the distinctive contribution made by Reader ministry.

Keywords: Psychological type, psychological temperament, Church of England, clergy, Readers

Introduction

An individual differences approach to ministry and to theological education is rooted both in theological and psychological traditions. The approach rooted in the theology of individual differences, as exemplified by Francis and Village (2015), draws on an understanding of men and women created in the image of God who reflects diversity (Genesis 1: 27). The approach rooted in the psychology of individual differences draws on a scientific investigation of human behaviour and mental functioning, as exemplified in personality theories. While personality psychologists have developed a number of different scientifically-grounded models of personality (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975; Costa & McCrae, 1985), the model that has been most fully and fruitfully employed within the fields of ministry and theological education is psychological type theory as proposed by Jung (1971) and subsequently operationalised and developed by Myers and McCaulley (1985) in the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, by Keirsey and Bates (1978) in the Keirsey Temperament Sorter, and by Francis (2005) in the Francis Psychological Type Scales.

The aim of the present study is to draw on psychological type theory to explore the psychological type profile of lay ministers trained and authorised to lead services and to preach within the Church of England (known as Readers) and to compare the profile of these lay ministers with the profile of ordained clergy. Do these two kinds of leaders (lay and ordained) display the same psychological type profile or do they display significantly different profiles that may reflect complementary ministries? The ground is set for the introduction of new empirical data by examining psychological type theory, psychological temperament theory (a development from type theory), and recent debate regarding the nature of reader ministry.

Psychological type theory

As popularised through books like *Gifts differing* (Myers & Myers, 1980), psychological type theory distinguishes between two orientations (introversion and extraversion), two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition), two judging functions (thinking and feeling), and two attitudes toward the outer world (judging and perceiving). According to this model, the two orientations (introversion and extraversion) and the two attitudes (judging and perceiving) define the kind of context within which the individual human psyche functions. The two perceiving functions (sensing and intuition) and the two judging functions (thinking and feeling) define the mental processes involved in interpreting and making sense of the world.

The two orientations are concerned with where energy is drawn from and focused. On the one hand, extraverts (E) are orientated toward the outer world; they are energised by the events and people around them. They enjoy communicating and thrive in stimulating and exciting environments. They tend to focus their attention upon what is happening outside themselves. They are usually open people, easy to get to know, and enjoy having many friends. On the other hand, introverts (I) are orientated toward their inner world; they are energised by their inner ideas and concepts. They enjoy solitude, silence, and contemplation, as they tend to focus their attention on what is happening in their inner life. They may prefer to have a small circle of close friends rather than many acquaintances.

The two perceiving functions are concerned with the way in which people perceive information. On the one hand, sensing types (S) focus on the realities of a situation as perceived by the senses. They tend to focus on specific details, rather than the overall picture. They are concerned with the actual, the real, and the practical and tend to be down to earth and matter of fact. On the other hand, intuitive types (N) focus on the possibilities of a situation, perceiving meanings and relationships. They may feel that perception by the senses is not as valuable as information gained as indirect associations and concepts impact on their

perception. They focus on the overall picture, rather than on specific facts and data.

The two judging functions are concerned with the criteria which people employ to make decisions and judgements. On the one hand, thinking types (T) make decisions and judgements based on objective, impersonal logic. They value integrity and justice. They are known for their truthfulness and for their desire for fairness. They consider conforming to principles to be of more importance than cultivating harmony. On the other hand, feeling types (F) make decisions and judgements based on subjective, personal values. They value compassion and mercy. They are known for their tactfulness and for their desire for peace. They are more concerned to promote harmony, than to adhere to abstract principles.

The two attitudes toward the outer world are determined by which of the two sets of functions (that is, perceiving S/N, or judging T/F) is preferred in dealings with the outer world. On the one hand, judging types (J) seek to order, rationalise, and structure their outer world, as they actively judge external stimuli. They enjoy routine and established patterns. They prefer to follow schedules in order to reach an established goal and may make use of lists, timetables, or diaries. They tend to be punctual, organised, and tidy. They prefer to make decisions quickly and to stick to their conclusions once made. On the other hand, perceiving types (P) do not seek to impose order on the outer world, but are more reflective, perceptive, and open, as they passively perceive external stimuli. They have a flexible, open-ended approach to life. They enjoy change and spontaneity. They prefer to leave projects open in order to adapt and improve them. Their behaviour may often seem impulsive and unplanned.

According to Jungian theory, for each individual either the preferred perceiving function (sensing or intuition) or the preferred judging function (thinking or feeling) takes preference over the other, leading to the emergence of one dominant function which shapes the individual's approach to life. Dominant sensing shapes the practical person; dominant

intuition shapes the imaginative person; dominant feeling shapes the humane person; and dominant thinking shapes the analytic person. According to Jungian theory, it is the function opposite to the dominant function which is least well developed in the individual (the inferior function). Thus, the dominant sensing type experiences most difficulty with the intuitive function; the dominant intuitive type experiences most difficulty with the sensing function; the dominant thinking type experiences most difficulty with the feeling function; and the dominant feeling type experiences most difficulty with the thinking function.

Psychological type theory has been applied to the field of religious professionals in North America, including Jewish rabbis as well as Christian ministers, priests, clergy, religious sisters and brothers, and seminarians, by a number of studies since the 1980s, as exemplified by Cabral (1984), Harbaugh (1984), Holsworth (1984), Macdaid, MacCauly, and Kainz (1986), and Bigelow, Fitzgerald, Busk, Girault, and Avis (1988). More recently this research tradition has been extended in the UK to the Church of England (Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, & Slater, 2007; Francis, Robbins, Duncan, & Whinney, 2010; Francis, Robbins, & Whinney, 2011). These studies point to key ways in which the psychological profile of Anglican clergymen and clergywomen serving in England differ from men and women in general. In turn these key differences suggest specific aptitudes, specific strengths, and specific weaknesses in ministry.

For example, in the UK population as a whole the preference for feeling is displayed by 70% of women compared with 35% of men (Kendall, 1998). Anglican clergymen in England and Wales, however, record preferences for feeling at a level closer to women in general than to men in general. This psychological preference for feeling may tend to create church congregations that feel more accessible to women than to men and thus accentuate the feminisation of the Anglican Church. In the UK population as a whole only between 20% and 25% of men and women prefer intuition with the large majority preferring sensing. Anglican

clergymen and clergywomen in England show a much higher level of preference for intuition than men and women in general. The psychological preference for intuition may lead to some communication problems between clergy and the wider society. A third significant difference between the psychological profile of Anglican clergy and the population in general occurs in respect of attitude toward the outer world. Overall Anglican clergy are more inclined to prefer judging than people in general. The psychological preference for judging may lead to perceiving types experiencing a sense of rigidity and inflexibility in church life. A fourth significant difference occurs in respect of the orientations. Overall Anglican clergy are more inclined to prefer introversion than the population as a whole. The psychological preference for introversion may lead to extraverts feeling less at ease in Anglican church congregations.

Alongside these studies of Anglican clergy in England, a second set of studies has explored the psychological profile of Anglican congregations (Francis, Duncan, Craig, & Luffman, 2004; Francis, Robbins, & Craig, 2011; Francis, 2013). Such studies tend to confirm that Anglican congregations reflect their leaders' preferences for feeling, for judging, and for introversion. Congregations, however, are more inclined to prefer sensing than is the case for their clergy. The implication of this difference is that clergy may be more inclined than their congregants to wish to foster and promote change in church life.

Psychological temperament theory

Psychological temperament theory is a development of psychological type theory proposed by Keirsey and Bates (1978). Temperament theory distinguishes between four main groupings organised by psychological type theory. The Epimethean Temperament characterises the SJ profile, people who long to be dutiful and exist primarily to be useful to the social units to which they belong. The Dionysian Temperament characterises the SP profile, people who want to be engaged, involved, and doing something new. The Promethean Temperament characterises the NT profile, people who want to understand,

explain, shape and predict realities, and who prize their personal competence. The Apollonian Temperament characterises the NF profile, people who quest for authenticity and for self-actualisation, who are idealistic and who have great capacity for empathic listening. Oswald and Kroeger (1988) applied Keirsey and Bates' (1978) model of the four temperaments to characterise four distinctive approaches to religious leadership.

The Epimethean Temperament (SJ) is styled 'the conserving, serving pastor'. SJ religious leaders tend to offer a traditional leadership style, bringing stability and continuity in whatever situation they are called to serve. They proclaim a simple and straightforward faith, committed to down-to-earth rules for the Christian life. They serve as protectors and conservers of the traditions inherited from the past. They excel at fostering a sense of loyalty and belonging. They bring order and stability to their congregations, creating plans, developing procedures and formulating policies; and they are keen that these procedures should be followed. They are realists who offer practical and down-to-earth solutions to pastoral problems.

The Dionysian Temperament (SP) is styled 'the action-oriented pastor'. SP religious leaders tend to offer a fun loving leadership style. They have little need for or interest in the abstract, the theoretical, and the non-practical aspects of theology and church life. They are flexible and spontaneous people who welcome the unplanned and unpredictable aspects of church life. They can bring the church to life with activities for everyone from cradle to grave. They are entertainers and performers at heart. They are at their best in a crisis and are good at handling conflict resolution.

The Promethean Temperament (NT) is styled 'the intellectual, competence-seeking pastor'. NT religious leaders tend to offer an academically and intellectually grounded leadership style. They are motivated by the search for meaning for truth and for possibilities. They are visionaries who need to excel in all they do, and they tend to push their

congregations to excel as well. They make great teachers, preachers, and advocates for social justice. They look for underlying principles rather than basic applications from their study of scripture. They see the value of opposing views and strive to allow alternative visions to be heard. They are more concerned with finding truth than with engineering harmony and compromise.

The Apollonian Temperament (NF) is styled 'the authenticity-seeking, relationship-oriented pastor'. NF religious leaders tend to offer an idealistic and romantic leadership style. They are attracted to helping roles that deal with human suffering. They can be articulate and inspiring communicators, committed to influencing others by touching their hearts. They have good empathic capacity, interpersonal skills, and pastoral counselling techniques. They find themselves listening to other people's problems in the most unlikely contexts, and really caring about them. NF clergy tend to be high on inspiration, but lower on the practical down-to-earth aspects of ministry. They are able to draw the best out of people and work well as the catalyst or facilitator in the congregation as long as others are on hand to work with and to implement their vision.

According to the study published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007), the most frequently occurring temperament among Anglican clergy was NF (35% of clergymen and 50% of clergywomen), followed by SJ (31% of clergymen and 29% of clergywomen), NT (27% of clergymen and 15% of clergywomen) and SP (7% of clergymen and 15% of clergywomen).

Reader ministry

The report, *Reader Upbeat*, published by the Church of England (2008) not only continued to affirm continuities between Reader ministry and ordained ministry, but also emphasised the distinctiveness of Reader ministry. *Reader Upbeat* argued that:

Readers are called to serve the Church of God and to work together with clergy and other ministers. They are to lead public worship, to preach and teach the Word of God, to assist at the eucharist and to share in pastoral and evangelistic work. As authorised lay ministers they are to encourage the ministries of all God's people, as the Spirit distributes gifts among us all. They are called to help the whole church to participate in God's mission to the world.

It was this particular emphasis within *Reader Upbeat* that prompted Francis, Jones, and Robbins (2014) to examine the psychological profile of men and women licensed to Reader Ministry in order to compare their profile with established data on the psychological profile of Anglican clergy. In this way they wished to test whether Readers presented as 'clones of the clergy or distinctive voices'. They drew on data provided by 108 male Readers and 128 female Readers serving in the Church of England who completed the Francis Psychological Type Scales (Francis, 2005) during participation in a range of workshops concerned with psychological type and preaching.

Two main conclusions can be drawn from the data published by Francis, Jones, and Robbins (2014) on the profile of Readers. First, Readers share a great deal in common with clergy in the ways in which they stand apart from the psychological type profile of the general population. Like clergymen, male Readers are more inclined to prefer intuition and feeling. Like clergywomen, female Readers are more likely to prefer introversion and intuition. In these ways Readers may be said to be more like clergy than distinctive voices reaching out to diverse communities.

On the other hand, when temperament theory is brought into consideration, there were ways in which Readers emerged as quite distinctive. In particular, the SJ profile was significantly more prominent among Readers, accounting for 56% of male Readers compared with 31% of clergymen, and for 39% of female Readers compared with 29% of

clergywomen. At the same time, the NF profile was significantly less prominent among Readers, accounting for 22% of male Readers compared with 35% of clergymen and for 32% of female Readers compared with 50% of clergywomen.

Research question

While the results generated by the study reported by Francis, Jones, and Robbins (2014) are intriguing, the generalisability of these findings is limited by the nature of their sample. The data were collected over a period of time from Readers participating in a range of workshops concerned with psychological type and preaching. In the absence of an opportunity to conduct a national study among those licensed to serve in Reader ministry, there is value in a replication study building up a second body of empirically based knowledge about the psychological type profile and temperament profile of Readers serving within the Church of England. The opportunity came through participation in the 2013 National Reader Conference which adopted as its theme psychological type and preaching.

Drawing on the findings from the earlier study of Readers reported by Francis, Jones, and Robbins (2014) the following four hypotheses were advanced. Readers would share with the psychological type profile of clergy reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007):

- a higher preference for introversion than found in the UK population;
- a higher preference for intuition than found in the UK population;
- a higher preference for feeling than found in the UK population;
- a higher preference for judging than found in the UK population.

Two further hypotheses were advanced regarding the differences in the psychological temperament profile recorded by Readers and by clergy: among Readers there would be

- a lower representation of the NF profile;
- a higher representation of the SJ profile.

Method

Procedure

The 2013 Readers Conference was arranged to explore the SIFT approach to biblical hermeneutics and liturgical preaching as discussed by Francis and Village (2008) in their book, *Preaching with all our souls*. The conference was structured to include both input concerning the theory and practical workshops designed to explore and test the theory. As part of the practical workshops participants were invited to complete a measure of psychological type in order to facilitate assignment to type-alike groups for workshop experience. All participants who completed the measure agreed to their data being used for research purposes.

Instrument

Psychological type was assessed by the Francis Psychological Type Scales (FPTS: Francis, 2005). This 40-item instrument comprises four sets of ten forced-choice items related to each of the four components of psychological type: orientation (extraversion or introversion), perceiving process (sensing or intuition), judging process (thinking or feeling), and attitude toward the outer world (judging or perceiving). Recent studies have demonstrated this instrument to function well in church-related contexts. For example, Francis, Craig, and Hall (2008) reported alpha coefficients of .83 and for EI scale, .76 for the SN scale, .73 for the TF scale, and .79 for the JP scale.

Sample

The sample comprised 59 men and 96 women. Among the men 7% were under the age of fifty, 20% were in their fifties, 58% were in their sixties, 12% were in their seventies, and 3% were in their eighties. Among the women, 6% were under the age of fifty, 18% were in their fifties, 55% were in their sixties, and 21% were in their seventies.

Data analysis

The scientific literature concerned with psychological type has developed a distinctive way of presenting type-related data. The conventional format of ‘type tables’ has been used in the present paper to allow the findings from this study to be compared with other relevant studies in the literature. In these tables the psychological type profiles of the male and female Readers are compared with the psychological type profiles of Anglican clergymen and Anglican clergywomen as reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). The statistical significance of differences between the present sample and the population norms and the Anglican clergy are tested by means of the Selection Ratio Index (*I*), an extension of the classic chi-square test (McCaulley, 1985).

Results

The first step in the data analysis examined the internal consistency reliability of the scales from which the type categories were derived, employing the alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951). The following coefficients were found: extraversion and introversion, .84; sensing and intuition, .76; thinking and feeling, .72; judging and perceiving, .79. All of these coefficients are above the threshold of .65 proposed by DeVellis (2003) and indicate that the instruments are functioning reliably among this sample.

- insert table 1 about here -

Table 1 presents the psychological type profile of the 59 male conference-attending Readers. These data demonstrate that these male Readers display clear preference for introversion (71%) over extraversion (29%), clear preference for sensing (58%) over intuition (42%), clear preference for thinking (66%) over feeling (34%), and clear preference for judging (88%) over perceiving (12%). In terms of dominant type preferences, 46% of the male Readers are dominant sensing types, 31% are dominant intuitive types, 15% are dominant thinking types, and 9% are dominant feeling types. The three most highly represented types among male Readers are ISTJ (31%), INTJ (17%) and ISFJ (15%). In terms

of psychological temperament, 56% of the male Readers reported SJ temperament, 27% reported NT temperament, 15% reported NF temperament, and 2% reported SP temperament.

- insert table 2 about here -

Table 2 presents the psychological type profile of the 96 female conference-attending Readers. These data demonstrate that these female Readers display clear preference for introversion (71%) over extraversion (29%), clear preference for sensing (68%) over intuition (28%), clear preference for feeling (71%) over thinking (29%), and clear preference for judging (84%) and over perceiving (16%). In terms of dominant type preferences, 49% of the female Readers are dominant sensing types, 25% are dominant feeling types, 21% are dominant intuitive types, and 5% are dominant thinking types. The three most highly represented types are ISFJ (29%), ISTJ (18%), and ESFJ (13%). In terms of psychological temperament, 60% of the female Readers reported SJ temperament, 22% reported NF temperament, 10% reported NT temperament, and 7% reported SP temperament.

Table 1 also compares the psychological type profile of 59 conference-attending male Readers with the profile of 626 clergymen published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). In terms of the binary distinctions, these data demonstrate that conference-attending male Readers are significantly more inclined than clergymen to prefer introversion (71% compared with 57%), significantly less inclined than clergymen to prefer intuition (42% compared with 62%), significantly less inclined to prefer feeling than clergymen (34% compared with 54%), and significantly more inclined to prefer judging than clergymen (88% compared with 68%). In terms of psychological temperament, 56% of the male Readers reported SJ temperament, compared with 31% of the clergymen; 15% of the male Readers reported NF temperament compared with 35% of the clergymen.

Table 2 also compares the psychological type profile of 96 conference-attending female Readers with the profile of 237 clergywomen published by Francis, Craig, Whinney,

Tilley, and Slater (2007). In terms of the binary distinctions, these data demonstrate that conference-attending female Readers are significantly more inclined to prefer introversion than clergywomen (71% compared with 54%), significantly less inclined to prefer intuition than clergywomen (32% compared with 65%), and significantly more inclined to prefer judging than clergywomen (84% compared with 65%). There is, however, no significant difference between conference-attending female Readers and clergywomen in terms of preference for feeling (71% and 74%). In terms of psychological temperament, 60% of the female readers reported SJ temperament, compared with 29% of the clergymen; 22% of the female readers reported NF temperament, compared with 50% of the clergymen.

Discussion and conclusion

The present study set out to examine the psychological profiles of a sample of 155 Readers who attended a national residential training event (59 men and 96 women) and to compare these data with two other samples: 236 experienced Readers within the Church of England (108 men and 128 women) published by Francis, Jones, and Robbins (2014), and 863 clergy within the Church of England (626 men and 237 women) published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007). These new data were employed to address two research questions. The first research question focused on psychological type theory and the second research question focused on psychological temperament theory.

The first research question was shaped by the findings from the earlier study of Readers published by Francis, Jones, and Robbins (2014) that focused on psychological type theory and suggested that Readers shared with clergy a psychological type profile that differed significantly from the psychological type profile of men and women in the general UK population. For those differences to be replicated among a second sample of Readers, it was hypothesised that Readers would share with the psychological type profile of clergy reported by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007)

- a higher preference for introversion than found in the UK population;
- a higher preference for intuition than found in the UK population;
- a higher preference for feeling than found in the UK population;
- a higher preference for judging than found in the UK population.

These trends were basically supported by the new data.

Among men in the UK population:

- 53% preferred introversion; the proportion rose slightly to 57% among clergymen, to 69% in the first study of male Readers and to 71% in the second study of male Readers;
- 27% preferred intuition; the proportion rose to 62% among clergymen, to 38% in the first study of male Readers and to 42% in the second study of male Readers;
- 35% preferred feeling; the proportion rose to 58% among clergymen, and to 54% in the first study of male Readers but fell to 34% in the second study of male Readers;
- 55% preferred judging; the proportion rose to 63% among clergymen, to 81% in the first study of male Readers, and to 88% in the second study of male Readers.

Among women in the UK population:

- 43% preferred introversion; the proportion rose to 54% among clergywomen, to 54% in the first study of female Readers, and to 71% in the second study of female Readers;
- 21% preferred intuition; the proportion rose to 65% among clergywomen, to 50% in the first study of female Readers, and to 32% in the second study of female Readers;
- 70% preferred feeling; and here the proportions remained fairly consistent at 74% among clergywomen, 65% in the first study of female Readers, and 71% in the second study of female Readers;

- 62% preferred judging; the proportion remained similar among clergywomen at 65%, but rose to 71% in the first study of female Readers and to 84% in the second study of female Readers.

The main anomaly in the second study of Readers concerns the fall in the proportion of feeling types among the men. This may be explained by the way in which the data were gathered from participants in a national conference that may have appealed more to thinking types.

The first research question revisited the objectives of the original study reported by Francis, Jones, and Robbins (2014). That project explored the tensions apparent in the report, *Reader Upbeat* (Church of England, 2008), between conceptualising Reader ministry as a distinctive pioneering ministry (reaching sectors of the population less easily reached by clergy) and conceptualising Reader ministry as continuous with established ordained ministry (reaching most effectively sectors of the population already reached by clergy). The notion was advanced that, if Readers are largely clones of the clergy, we might expect Readers to differ from the psychological type profile for the UK population norms in the same way as clergy. Four conclusions emerge from these new data set alongside the data reported by Francis, Jones, and Robbins (2014).

The first conclusion concerns the orientations, the distinction between introversion and extraversion. It is clear from these studies that introversion is over-represented among both clergy and Readers (and even more so among Readers). The danger is that, in the wider population, extraverts may see the religious leadership offered by clergy and Readers as somewhat withdrawn, aloof, and disengaged from society. Extraverts may find difficulty in accessing religious communities in which introversion may appear over-valued among the leadership.

The second conclusion concerns the perceiving functions, the distinction between sensing and intuition. It is clear from these studies that intuition is over-represented among both clergy and Readers (although less so among Readers). The danger is that, in the wider population, sensing types may view religious leaders as ‘dreamers’, or as ‘too heavenly-minded to be of any earthly good’. Sensing types may find difficulty in feeling fully at home and valued in religious communities in which intuition may appear over-valued among the leadership.

The third conclusion concerns the judging functions, the distinction between thinking and feeling. It is clear from these studies that feeling is over-represented among both clergymen and male Readers (although less so among the male Readers who attended the national conference). The danger is that, in the wider population, the majority of men (who prefer thinking) may view male religious leaders as displaying a characteristically feminine personality profile, appearing sentimental, over-concerned with promoting harmony in human relationships, and reluctant to handle difficult questions about beliefs and social justice. Thinking types (especially among men) may find difficulty in identifying role models among their religious leaders.

The fourth conclusion concerns the attitudes toward the outside world, the distinction between judging and perceiving. It is clear from these studies that judging is over-represented among both clergy and Readers (and even more so among Readers). The danger is that, in the wider population, perceiving types may experience religious leaders as rigid, inflexible, and unable to handle change or spontaneity. Perceiving types may find difficulty in feeling fully at home and valued in religious communities in which judging may appear over-valued among the leadership.

Taken together, these four conclusions strongly suggest that, in the current generation, the psychological type profile of serving Readers fits them more adequately to conduct a

model of ministry already well established by the ordained clergy than to extend that ministry in pioneering new directions. Within the current cohort of conference-attending Readers, it may be in particular the minority (9% of males and 7% of females) combining preferences for extraversion and for perceiving, who could find themselves in the strongest position to fulfil the vision of the report *Reader Upbeat*, to forge new opportunities for the public presence of the church, and to be acting in ‘fresh expressions’ of church.

The second research question was shaped by drawing psychological temperament theory into the discussion and by observing that a comparison between the data on clergy published by Francis, Craig, Whinney, Tilley, and Slater (2007) and the data on Readers published by Francis, Jones, and Robbins (2014) suggested that clergy and Readers modelled different styles of religious leadership as characterised by Oswald and Kroeger (1988). For those differences to be replicated among a second sample of Readers, it was hypothesised that, compared with clergy there would be:

- a lower representation of the Apollonian NF profile among Readers;
- a higher representation of the Epimethean SJ profile among Readers.

These trends were supported by the new data.

Among clergymen 31% preferred the Epimethean SJ style of leadership. The proportions rose to 56% in the first study of male Readers and to 56% in the second study of male Readers. Among clergywomen 29% preferred the Epimethean SJ style of leadership. The proportions rose to 39% in the first study of female Readers and to 60% in the second study of female Readers.

Among clergymen 35% preferred the Apollonian NF style of leadership. The proportions fell to 22% in the first study of male Readers and to 15% in the second study of male Readers. Among clergywomen 50% preferred the Apollonian NF style of leadership.

The proportions fell to 32% in the first study of female Readers and to 22% in the second study of female Readers. Two main conclusions emerge from these data.

The first conclusion concerns the different experience of religious communities (or church congregations) being led by Apollonian or by Epimethean religious leaders. With Apollonian leaders religious communities may grow accustomed to imaginative new ideas, inspirational leadership, and challenges for change and development (stimulated by intuition) coupled with concern for harmony, values and good relationships (stimulated by feeling). With Epimethean Readers religious communities may grow accustomed to stability, established patterns, and sound organisation (stimulated by sensing and judging). Over time Apollonian and Epimethean leadership styles shape very different kinds of religious communities.

The second conclusion concerns the experience of Apollonian and Epimethean religious leaders working together in the same ministry team. Apollonian and Epimethean religious leaders may (unconsciously) set out to achieve very different ends in their style of leadership. Apollonian leaders may want to promote new things in the local church, while Epimethean leaders may want to protect the established provision. Epimethean leaders may wish to insist on clear structure, formal procedures and clear accountability, while Apollonian leaders may wish to protect themselves and others from signs of inflexibility or rigidity. These two temperaments need to understand each other well and to respect each other generously in order to avoid personal and professional tension within the leadership team.

The present study, like the previous study reported by Francis, Jones, and Robbins (2014), has employed psychological type theory and empirical investigation to test aspects of the potential distinctiveness of Reader ministry, compared with that of ordained clergy. A significant weakness of both studies concerns the nature of the samples. The conclusions are based on two samples of 236 Readers and 155 Readers (compared with 863 clergy), and both

of samples of Readers were obtained by opportunity sampling. In order to build on these studies there is the need for a systematic survey of those engaged in Reader ministry capable both of providing a more authoritative psychological type profile and of establishing how individual differences in the psychological type preferences of Readers may lead to significant differences in the ways in which their ministry is expressed.

References

- Bigelow, E. D., Fitzgerald, R., Busk, P., Girault, E., & Avis, J. (1988). Psychological characteristics of Catholic sisters: Relationships between the MBTI and other measures. *Journal of Psychological Type, 14*, 32-36.
- Cabral, G. (1984). Psychological types in a Catholic convent: applications to community living and congregational data. *Journal of Psychological Type, 8*, 16-22.
- Cattell, R. B., Eber, H. W., & Tatsuoka, M. M. (1970). *Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF)*. Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.
- Church of England (2004). *Mission-shaped Church: Church planting and fresh expressions of church in a changing context*. London: Church House Publishing.
- Church of England. (2008). *Reader upbeat: Quickening the tempo of Reader ministry in the Church Today*. London: General Synod GS1689.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources. doi.org/10.1037/t07564-000
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297-334. doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. London: Sage.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (adult and junior)*. London: Hodder and Stoughton. doi.org/10.1037/t05462-000
- Francis, L. J. (2005). *Faith and psychology: Personality, religion and the individual*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Francis, L. J. (2013). The psychological type profile of a church: A case study. *Comprehensive Psychology, 2*, 6. doi.org/10.2466/01.09.CP.2.6

- Francis, L. J., Clymo, J., & Robbins, M. (2014). Fresh Expressions: Reaching those psychological types conventional forms of church find it hard to reach? *Practical Theology*, 7, 252-267. doi.org/10.1179/1756073X14Z.000000000045
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., & Hall, G. (2008). Psychological type and attitude toward Celtic Christianity among committed churchgoers in the United Kingdom: An empirical study. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 23, 181-191.
doi.org/10.1080/13537900802024543
- Francis, L. J., Craig, C. L., Whinney, M., Tilley, D., & Slater, P. (2007). Psychological profiling of Anglican clergy in England: Employing Jungian typology to interpret diversity, strengths, and potential weaknesses in ministry. *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 11, 266-284. doi.org/10.1515/IJPT.2007.17
- Francis, L. J., Duncan, B., Craig, C. L., & Luffman, G. (2004). Type patterns among Anglican congregations in England. *Journal of Adult Theological Education*, 1, 66-77. doi.org/10.1558/jate.1.1.65.36058
- Francis, L. J., Jones, S. H., & Robbins, M. (2014). The psychological type profile of Readers in the Church of England: Clones of the clergy or distinctive voices? *Journal of Anglican Studies*, 12, 165-184. doi.org/10.1017/S1740355313000077
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Craig, C.L. (2011). The psychological type profile of Anglican churchgoers in England: Compatible or incompatible with their clergy? *International Journal of Practical Theology*, 15, 243-259. doi.org/10.1515/IJPT.2011.036
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Duncan, B., & Whinney, M. (2010). Confirming the psychological type profile of Anglican Clergymen in England: A ministry for intuitives. In B. Ruelas & V. Briseno (Eds.), *Psychology of Intuition* (pp. 211-219). New York: Nova Science Publishers.

- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., & Whinney, M. (2011). Women priests in the Church of England: Psychological type profile. *Religions*, 2, 389-397. doi.org/10.3390/rel2030389
- Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2008). *Preaching with all our souls*. London: Continuum.
- Francis, L. J., & Village, A. (2015). Go and observe the sower: Seeing empirical theology at work. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 28, 155-183. doi.org/10.1163/15709256-12341325
- Harbaugh, G. L. (1984). The person in ministry: Psychological type and the seminary. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 8, 23-32.
- Holsworth, T. E. (1984). Type preferences among Roman Catholic seminarians. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 8, 33-35.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). *Psychological types: The collected works, volume 6*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Keirsey, D., & Bates, M. (1978). *Please understand me*. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis.
- Kendall, E. (1998). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Step 1 manual supplement*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Macdaid, G. P., McCaulley, M. H., & Kainz, R.I. (1986). *Myers-Briggs type indicator: Atlas of type tables*. Gainesville, FL: Centre for Application of Psychological Type Inc.
- McCaulley, M. H. (1985). The Selection Ratio Type Table: A research strategy for comparing type distributions. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 10, 46-56.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Myers, I. B., & Myers, P. B. (1980). *Gifts differing*. Palo Alto: CA, Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Oswald, R. M., & Kroeger, O. (1988). *Personality type and religious leadership*. Washington, DC: The Alban Institute.

Table 1

Type distribution for male conference-attending Readers compared with Anglican clergymen

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences							
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 18 (30.5%) <i>I</i> = 3.08*** +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 9 (15.3%) <i>I</i> = 1.95* +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 3 (5.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.56 +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 10 (16.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.54 +++++	E <i>n</i> = 17 (28.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.67*							
+++++	+++++		+++++	I <i>n</i> = 42 (71.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.25*							
+++++	+++++		+++++	S <i>n</i> = 34 (57.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.50**							
+++++	+++++		+++++	N <i>n</i> = 25 (42.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.69**							
+++++			+++++	T <i>n</i> = 39 (66.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.42**							
+++++			++	F <i>n</i> = 20 (33.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.63**							
+++++				J <i>n</i> = 52 (88.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.29***							
+++++				P <i>n</i> = 7 (11.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.37***							
ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ISFP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.7%) <i>I</i> = 1.18 +	INFP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00**	INTP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.32 ++	Pairs and Temperaments							
				IJ <i>n</i> = 40 (67.8%) <i>I</i> = 1.79***							
				IP <i>n</i> = 2 (3.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.18**							
				EP <i>n</i> = 5 (8.5%) <i>I</i> = 0.66							
				EJ <i>n</i> = 12 (20.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.67							
				ST <i>n</i> = 23 (39.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.97***							
				SF <i>n</i> = 11 (18.6%) <i>I</i> = 1.01							
				NF <i>n</i> = 9 (15.3%) <i>I</i> = 0.44**							
				NT <i>n</i> = 16 (27.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.02							
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ESFP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ENFP <i>n</i> = 3 (5.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.76 +++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 2 (3.4%) <i>I</i> = 1.33 +++	SJ <i>n</i> = 33 (55.9%) <i>I</i> = 1.80***							
				SP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.24							
				NP <i>n</i> = 6 (10.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.41*							
				NJ <i>n</i> = 19 (32.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.87							
				TJ <i>n</i> = 36 (61.0%) <i>I</i> = 1.73***							
				TP <i>n</i> = 3 (5.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.45							
				FP <i>n</i> = 4 (6.8%) <i>I</i> = 0.33**							
				FJ <i>n</i> = 16 (27.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.82							
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 5 (8.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.29 +++++	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 1 (1.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.25 +	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 3 (5.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.56 +++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 3 (5.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.65 +++++	IN <i>n</i> = 14 (23.7%) <i>I</i> = 0.67							
+++				EN <i>n</i> = 11 (18.6%) <i>I</i> = 0.71							
				IS <i>n</i> = 28 (47.5%) <i>I</i> = 2.22***							
				ES <i>n</i> = 6 (10.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.60							
				ET <i>n</i> = 10 (16.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.94							
				EF <i>n</i> = 7 (11.9%) <i>I</i> = 0.47*							
				IF <i>n</i> = 13 (22.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.77							
				IT <i>n</i> = 29 (49.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.73***							
Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)				Dominant Types			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
E-TJ	8	13.6	0.94	I-TP	1	1.7	0.23	Dt.T	9	15.3	0.70
E-FJ	4	6.8	0.42	I-FP	1	1.7	0.15*	Dt.F	5	8.5	0.31***
ES-P	0	0.0	0.00	IS-J	27	45.8	2.58***	Dt.S	27	45.8	2.15***
EN-P	5	8.5	0.91	IN-J	13	22.0	1.09	Dt.N	18	30.5	1.04

Note: *N* = 59 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table 2

Type distribution for female conference-attending Readers compared with Anglican clergywomen

The Sixteen Complete Types				Dichotomous Preferences							
ISTJ <i>n</i> = 17 (17.7%) <i>I</i> = 3.82*** +++++	ISFJ <i>n</i> = 28 (29.2%) <i>I</i> = 2.38*** +++++	INFJ <i>n</i> = 10 (10.4%) <i>I</i> = 0.99 +++++	INTJ <i>n</i> = 5 (5.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.77 +++++	E I S N	<i>n</i> = 28 <i>n</i> = 68 <i>n</i> = 65 <i>n</i> = 31	(29.2%) (70.8%) (67.7%) (32.3%)	<i>I</i> = 0.63** <i>I</i> = 1.31*** <i>I</i> = 1.91*** <i>I</i> = 0.50***				
	+++++	+++++		T F	<i>n</i> = 28 <i>n</i> = 68	(29.2%) (70.8%)	<i>I</i> = 1.11 <i>I</i> = 0.96				
	+++++	+++++		J P	<i>n</i> = 81 <i>n</i> = 15	(84.1%) (15.6%)	<i>I</i> = 1.31*** <i>I</i> = 0.44***				
ISTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ISFP <i>n</i> = 5 (5.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.54 +++++	INFP <i>n</i> = 3 (3.1%) <i>I</i> = 0.22** +++	INTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	Pairs and Temperaments							
				IJ IP EP EJ	<i>n</i> = 60 <i>n</i> = 8 <i>n</i> = 7 <i>n</i> = 21	(62.5%) (8.3%) (7.3%) (21.9%)	<i>I</i> = 1.83*** <i>I</i> = 0.42** <i>I</i> = 0.47* <i>I</i> = 0.72				
				ST SF NF NT	<i>n</i> = 18 <i>n</i> = 47 <i>n</i> = 21 <i>n</i> = 10	(18.8%) (49.0%) (21.9%) (10.4%)	<i>I</i> = 1.65 <i>I</i> = 2.04*** <i>I</i> = 0.44*** <i>I</i> = 0.71				
ESTP <i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.00	ESFP <i>n</i> = 2 (2.1%) <i>I</i> = 1.23 ++	ENFP <i>n</i> = 4 (4.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.40 ++++	ENTP <i>n</i> = 1 (1.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.35 +	SJ SP NP NJ	<i>n</i> = 58 <i>n</i> = 7 <i>n</i> = 8 <i>n</i> = 23	(60.4%) (7.3%) (8.3%) (24.0%)	<i>I</i> = 2.08*** <i>I</i> = 1.15 <i>I</i> = 0.29*** <i>I</i> = 0.68*				
				TJ TP FP FJ	<i>n</i> = 27 <i>n</i> = 1 <i>n</i> = 14 <i>n</i> = 54	(28.1%) (1.0%) (14.6%) (56.3%)	<i>I</i> = 1.39 <i>I</i> = 0.18 <i>I</i> = 0.49** <i>I</i> = 1.27*				
ESTJ <i>n</i> = 1 (1.0%) <i>I</i> = 0.19 +	ESFJ <i>n</i> = 12 (12.5%) <i>I</i> = 1.85 +++++	ENFJ <i>n</i> = 4 (4.2%) <i>I</i> = 0.28** ++++	ENTJ <i>n</i> = 4 (4.2%) <i>I</i> = 1.23 ++++	IN EN IS ES	<i>n</i> = 18 <i>n</i> = 13 <i>n</i> = 50 <i>n</i> = 15	(18.8%) (13.5%) (52.1%) (15.6%)	<i>I</i> = 0.57*** <i>I</i> = 0.43 <i>I</i> = 2.47*** <i>I</i> = 1.09				
	+++++	+++++		ET EF IF IT	<i>n</i> = 6 <i>n</i> = 22 <i>n</i> = 46 <i>n</i> = 22	(6.3%) (22.9%) (47.9%) (22.9%)	<i>I</i> = 0.51 <i>I</i> = 0.68 <i>I</i> = 1.20 <i>I</i> = 1.65*				
Jungian Types (E)				Jungian Types (I)				Dominant Types			
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>		<i>n</i>	%	<i>Index</i>
E-TJ	5	5.2	0.59	I-TP	0	0.0	0.0	Dt.T	5	5.2	0.46
E-FJ	16	16.7	0.77	I-FP	8	8.3	0.48*	Dt.F	24	25.0	0.64*
ES-P	2	2.1	0.99	IS-J	45	46.9	2.78***	Dt.S	47	49.0	2.58***
EN-P	5	5.2	0.39*	IN-J	15	15.6	0.90	Dt.N	20	20.8	0.68

Note: *N* = 96 (NB: + = 1% of *N*)

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$